



# **Course Review Terms of Reference**

SCU College

## Scope

These Terms of Reference apply to the review of a single course or suite of courses within a discipline area under the [Academic Quality Standards and Integrity Policy](#) and [Course Review Procedures](#). They may be used for Course Reviews that form part of Faculty/College Review. Unless otherwise specified, the review should include assessment of the past seven years of the course both in its current form and in its previous iterations.

As per the [Academic Quality Standards and Integrity Policy](#), the course review will:

- i. evaluate the suitability of course design in the context of the principles set out in the [Curriculum Design and Development Policy](#), including compliance with the Australian Qualifications Framework and any professional accreditation requirements;
- ii. evaluate the effectiveness of the course in delivering intended student learning outcomes;
- iii. evaluate the quality of the academic experience for students in the course, from pre-admission to post-graduation;
- iv. evaluate the suitability and effectiveness of staffing and other resources for the course;
- v. evaluate the financial viability and strategic fit of the course in the University's overall academic profile;
- vi. examine any other matters requested by the Chair, Academic Board; and
- vii. make recommendations to Academic Board concerning any of the matters above, including a recommendation as to whether the course should be reaccredited with or without conditions.

### Included Courses

Course Code	Course Title
2127279	Diploma of Business
2127298	Diploma of Science
9909995	English Language Proficiency
2307160	Preparing for Success Program

*\*All active courses that are not also in Teach Out. This includes suspended courses.*

### Excluded Courses

Course Code	Course Title
9509921	Undergraduate Qualifying Program
9509920	Postgraduate Qualifying Program
2125150	Diploma of Health
2125250	Diploma of Hotel Management
2125103	Diploma of Civil Construction (Engineering and Management)
2127317	Diploma of Allied Health

*Note: Courses that undergo rigorous professional accreditation by an external body, or courses that are currently in teach-out can be excluded upon approval of the Chair, Academic Board*

## **Aim of Course Review**

The aim of a Course Review is to review the academic quality of a course, as well as its currency, financial viability (including appropriate resourcing), and performance over time. This is achieved by applying a process of overarching academic scrutiny to the course. The Review Report provides details on the review as well as commendations, affirmations and recommendations for change.

This report will be presented to the Academic Board who will decide to either:

- a) approve that the course be reaccredited;
- b) require specific actions to be taken prior to or as a condition of approving that the course be reaccredited; or
- c) advise University Council that the course should not remain accredited and be removed from the offerings of the University.

## **Conduct of the Review**

The Review will be conducted in line with the Academic Quality Standards and Integrity Policy and Course Review Procedures.

Course Reviews will be conducted within seven years of the last accreditation or reaccreditation of the course by the University Council (or Academic Board as delegated) in accordance with the Course Review Procedures by one or more suitably qualified experts, appointed by the Chair, Academic Board in consultation with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality), including:

- at least one academic staff member of another university, who will be an independent expert;
- optionally, a representative from the relevant professional community; and
- optionally, an academic staff member of the University from a different Faculty or College to the Faculty or College that owns the course.

For details of the review timelines – see Faculty Review Terms of Reference.

## **Course Review Assessment and Submission**

### **Review Panel**

The Review submission requirement and timing will be conducted in line with the Course Review Procedures. Reviewers are asked to:

- i. Review the Faculty's documentation and recommend whether they are 'satisfied' or 'not satisfied' that the course meets the criteria in Appendix A, and provide supporting justification;
- ii. Seek additional information, if required, in order to make an informed assessment; and
- iii. For each course reviewed, recommend Academic Board either reaccredits, reaccredits with conditions, or not the reaccredit.
- iv. Contribute to the final Review Report commendations, affirmations and recommendations

with rationale and examples where required.

## Faculty

The relevant Executive Dean / College Dean, in consultation with staff, will produce a Course Review Submission. The Submission will address the Course Review Criteria as stated in Appendix A. The main body of the Course Review Submission (not including the supporting documents) should be no more than 2500 words. Supporting documents to be collated and provided to reviewers are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1 Supporting documents included in the submission**

Documents	Source
1. Previous Course Review Report	Faculty
2. Action Plan and Status of the Previous Report Recommendations	Faculty
3. Course Structure Documents, including <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Overview of course structure</li> <li>b. Brief description of each unit in the course</li> <li>c. Graduate Attribute Report (including assessment tasks)</li> <li>d. Levels of Learning</li> </ol>	Faculty to prepare from Unit and Course Management System (UCMS) Report
4. Evidence of Benchmarking	Faculty to prepare from previous Accreditation Committee submissions if available, or more recent benchmarking.
5. Course Summary Report (referencing Annual Course Reports and Course Performance Reports) – maximum 500 words	The Course Coordinator will develop a Course Summary Report (maximum 500 words) as per the <a href="#">Course Review Procedures</a> . The Executive Dean / College Dean must consult with other relevant Faculties to ensure that all the issues relevant to double degrees and combined degrees are reviewed where required.
6. Survey Reports (First Year Survey; 7. Graduates Outcomes Survey; Beyond Graduation Survey)	Office of Business Intelligence and Quality
8. Staff Profiles including workload allocations	Executive Dean / College Dean and/or Course Coordinator
9. Summary of Unit and Teaching Feedback – Unit Feedback Survey	Office of Business Intelligence and Quality

## Appendix A – Course Review Report Criteria

The Course Reviewer(s) will be required to assess and make comment on the following criteria in the Course Review Report. These criteria align with the [Higher Education Standards Framework 2021](#), and specifically those standards which are relevant at the course level.

### 1. *Admission and Student Transition*

Are the course's admission requirements transparent and appropriate?

Are students provided with appropriate assistance in their transition to their studies?

### 2. *Course Financial Viability*

Is the course financially viable?

How has the course performed over time? Consider demand, student count, EFTSL, success and retention over a seven-year period.

### 3. *Course Design and Delivery*

Does the structure and overall design of the course provide a clear, distinct and coherent program of study? Consider:

- a) alignment of learning outcomes and graduate attributes;
- b) appropriate balance in the sequencing of core units, majors, minors and electives to achieve learning outcomes;
- c) appropriate entry pathways (e.g., advanced standing) and exit points;
- d) alignment with the [Australian Qualifications Framework](#) appropriateness of the course delivery model;
- e) extent to which the curriculum and resources are innovative, engaging and leverage technological advancements in education;
- f) success in meeting, and relevance to, industry needs.

### 4. *Course Content*

Does the content and learning activities of the course engage with advanced knowledge and practice consistent with the AQF level and the expected learning outcomes? This will include consideration of the extent to which the course:

- a) engages with current and emerging knowledge and scholarship in relevant academic disciplines;
- b) addresses the underlying theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the relevant academic disciplines;
- c) uses appropriate and current unit materials, including readings, topic selection, supporting materials, case studies, tutorial exercises etc.; and
- d) has a real world focus derived from the professions which with the course is aligned.

## 5. **Course Alignment**

Does the course align strategically with:

- other courses of the Faculty and the University;
- the Faculty's Operational Plan; and
- the University's Strategic Plan and/or other priorities articulated by the University?

## 6. **Professional Accreditation**

Does the course meet the Professional Accreditation/Recognition standards appropriate for the course?

Where professional accreditation of a course is required for graduates to be eligible to practise, has the course maintained appropriate certification by the relevant external agency?

## 7. **Academic Quality**

Do the assessment content, weighting, type and variety across all units in the course support students' achievement of learning outcomes and acquisition of the University's graduate attributes? This will include consideration of:

- a) appropriateness and relevance of the assessment materials, including assessment volume and context;
- b) appropriateness of scaffolding of learning;
- c) methods for assessment and assessment moderation; and
- d) integration of community-engaged learning and work-integrated learning.

Are the teaching and learning approaches and course delivery effective with regards to location, mode(s) of delivery and student entry pathways? In part, effectiveness is demonstrated through:

- success rates;
- progression rates;
- attrition rates;
- completion times.

How does the Course perform with regard to student and graduate satisfaction, including experiences of Blackboard (Learning Management System)? Comparison with University and sector averages should be made.

Have the Course Coordinator and Unit Assessors responded appropriately to student feedback on their educational experiences?

Are there any identified risks to the quality of the course?

## 8. **Staffing and Other Resources**

Is the staffing complement for the course sufficient to meet the educational, academic support and administrative needs of the various student cohorts undertaking the course?

Is the academic staffing profile for the course appropriate and sufficient to provide the level and extent of academic oversight and teaching capacity needed to lead students in intellectual inquiry necessary for level of expected learning outcomes?

Are academic staffing resources and expertise utilised effectively?

Is there effective engagement of Unit Assessors in each Unit, and timely development and availability of unit materials?

Is there timely grading of assessment, finalisation of grades and notification of grades to students?

**9. Learning Resources and Educational and Other Support**

Do the learning resources (e.g., library collections and services, creative works, notes, laboratory facilities, studio sessions, simulations and software) that are specified or recommended for the Course relate directly to the learning outcomes? Are they up to date and, where supplied as part of the Course, accessible when needed by students?

Do students have access to learning support services that are consistent with the requirements of their Course, their mode of study and the learning needs of student cohorts, including arrangements for supporting and maintaining contact with students who are off campus?

**10. Any Other Matters**

These may include: *Quality and appropriateness of the Faculty's relationship with its professional community, locally and internationally, in the context of the Course; Work integrated learning and other Industry or business links (existing, proposed or potential); Articulation arrangements or pathways (existing, proposed or potential); Relevance of the Course to other courses offered by the Faculty, to the Faculty Plan, the Academic Plan and the Strategic priorities of the University.*